



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9/1
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,718	01/23/2004	Bryan Nathan Wilmoth	M005Z/281291	7327
23370	7590	11/08/2006	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP 1100 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309			KIM, SANG K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3654	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/763,718	WILMOTH ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
SANG KIM	3654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date . . .
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: . . .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez, U.S. Patent No. 4659029, in view of Lai, U.S. Patent No. 618917 B1.

Regarding claim 22, Rodriguez '029 teaches a system for cutting a traveling web from a first spool and onto a second spool by feeding a turn-up tape (24) along a transfer track (28) beneath the paper web (20) and to a position adjacent to the nip (52); an air supply system which controls the air pressure, see figure 5, and a drive assembly (43, i.e., a hand crank) capable of driving the turn-up tape along the transfer track toward the nip, wherein the drive is capable of being powered by manual power or motor power, see figure 1, and on column 8, lines 59-61.

Rodriguez '029 does not explicitly state that the drive is capable of being powered by both manual power and motor power with a clutch mechanism.

Lai discloses a clutch 25 provided to change the electrically driving operation 21 into a manually driving operation 30, see figures 4A and 5A, and column 2, lines 17-59.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Rodriguez to make the drive capable of being powered by both manual power and motor power which can be switched with a clutch mechanism as taught by Lai '917, in case one of the drive systems fails.

Regarding claim 21, as advanced above, Rodriguez '029 and '634 disclose the claimed invention except for an automation mode with a computer for the system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus by adding a computer into an automation process since computers are well known and used throughout the industry.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 4, 6-7, and 21 have been amended.

Claim 22 has been added.

Claims 13-20 are allowed as indicated from the Previous Office Action.

Claims 1-20 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 9/18/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to claim 21.

Applicant argues that Rodriguez fails to provide a system that can be powered by both manual power and motor power. Furthermore, applicant argues that the Lai reference is different from applicant's invention, especially how the clutches work.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986). The rejection was based on Rodriguez in view of Lai, and not just Rodriguez alone.

Applicant's claims 21-22 merely recite, "the drive comprises at least one directional clutch associated with a manual power portion and at least one directional clutch associated with a motor power portion" and "the drive is capable of being powered by both manual power and motor power" respectively. Basically, claims 21-22 do not recite how the clutches work as explained in the other allowed claims. Thus, the rejection is still maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SANG KIM whose telephone number is 571-272-6947.

The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki, can be reached on (571) 272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SK

11/2/06



WILLIAM A. RIVERA
PRIMARY EXAMINER